THE REMONSTRANCE.

BOSTON, OCTOBER, 1912

The Remonstrance is published quarterly by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Illinois, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Oregon, South Dakota, Connecticut, Maryland, New Hampshire, Wisconsin, Ohio, Virginia and other states.

Any one who desires to receive the quarterly numbers for one year can do so by enclosing 25 cents in stamps to the Treasurer,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN,
Walnut St., Brookline.

Information in regard to The Remonstrance and other publications of the Association may be obtained from the Secretary, Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women.

MASSACHUSETTS

Forty-one Branch Committees; 17,002* members in 354 cities, towns, and villages.

MISS MARY S. AMES, President.

MRS. J. RANDOLPH COOLIDGE,
MISS ANNA L. DAWES,
MRS. CHARLES ELIOT GUILD,
MRS. CHARLES D. NOMANS,
MISS AGNES IRWIN,
MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY,
Vice-Presidents.

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer, Walnut Street, Brookline.
MISS ELIZABETH JOHNSON, Rec. Sec'y.
MRS. CHARLES P. STRONG, Cor. Sec'y.
Room 615 Kensington Building, Boston.

** Net present membership of women over 21 years of age: eliminating those names which the Association has lost from deaths, resignations and removals from the State.*

AN OVERWHELMING SUFFRAGE DEFEAT

THE rejection of the proposed suffrage amendment to the Ohio Constitution on the 3d of September is a heavy blow to the suffragists. They had made a vigorous campaign, extending over several months and reaching the remotest corners of the state. Up to the very day of the election, they were confident and boastful. Yet, while the voters accepted all but eight of the forty-two proposed amendments submitted to them, they buried the suffrage proposal under an adverse majority of 87,455.

What is the explanation? The suffragists are prompt to charge their defeat to the liquor interests. That explanation has become somewhat threadbare. It is sufficiently refuted, in this instance, by the fact that it was not only the cities, but the rural districts, where the liquor interests are a negligible factor, that voted against the amendment. Only 19 out of 88 counties voted for it.

The real reason must be sought elsewhere. The truth seems to be that, in Ohio as elsewhere, the typical political woman does not appeal to the average man any more than to the women whom he represents. The spectacle which she presents, haranguing passing crowds from a soapbox at the street corner, or making breathless speeches from an automobile on a "whirlwind campaign" may divert and amuse him, but he does not care to have it indefinitely multiplied by the grant of the ballot. Even in Ohio, where he voted for nearly all the radical proposals submitted to him, he drew the line at this.

It seems probable also that the peculiar character of the suffrage campaign in Ohio alienated more voters than it won. The average man likes fair play. There is rowdyism sometimes in men's political gatherings; but the average man, if he is a Democrat, does not try to break up Republican rallies, nor, if he is a Republican, does he try to hoot down Democratic speakers. It is quite plain that the Margaret-Foley style of campaign, the deliberate and systematic interruption of anti-suffrage meetings, and the persistent heckling of anti-suffrage speakers did not work in Ohio.

There is ground to hope that the Ohio campaign and its result mark the turning of the tide in the frenzied suffrage agitation. The effect of this overwhelming suffrage defeat will be felt in all the states which are to vote upon similar proposals in November. It will dampen the ardor of the suffragists; and it will greatly encourage the women who, organized hastily in an emergency, are working to avert the evils which woman suffrage would bring upon themselves and upon society.

The Ohio suffragists are prompt to declare that, through the initiative-referendum, they will bring this issue again before the voters next year. Possibly, if they follow the plan of the Illinois suffragists, of paying a dollar a hundred for signatures, they may get enough names to their petition. But what chance is there that a hostile majority of 87,000 can be reversed in a year, or in five years? It is more likely that the Ohio voters, like those of Oregon,—irritated by the repeated raising of an issue once definitely settled, will increase the majority against it.

TEMPERANCE AND SUFFRAGE

For years, it has been argued that woman suffrage would promote temperance and temperance legislation. The Woman's Christian Temperance Union has espoused suffrage under that assumption, and the National Prohibition party has incorporated suffrage in its platform.

But the practical workings of woman suffrage, in states where it has been adopted, do not sustain this assumption. Upon this point, Dr. Clarence True Wilson, a leading temperance speaker, writes thus in the Portland (Ore.) Telegram:

"As a prohibition advocate, I am consistent in opposing suffrage for women, because no state has adopted woman's suffrage without setting back the temperance cause 25 years. I have been over these states recently and have never found a temper-

ance man who is not disappointed at the results of votes for women. Look at Los Angeles, almost voting dry two years ago with men voting, while now with women enfranchised and with 2,000 more women than men voting, they have defeated prohibition by 14,000 majority. See the dry town of Pasadena, saloonless throughout its history, voting in a wet ticket with the first coming of the women into the elective franchise. And does not every intelligent reader know that the liquor men of Oregon have largely withdrawn opposition to woman suffrage because they have found that women's votes have developed no terrors for them? Is one of the papers that have always supported the liquor dealers now opposing woman suffrage?

A MOVEMENT THAT FAILED

The attempt to persuade the eleventh biennial convention of the General Confederation of Women's Clubs at San Francisco in July to commit the Federation to woman suffrage failed, as it deserved to.

The movement had been thoroughly organized, and culminated in a direct appeal from the Official Board of the National American Woman Suffrage Association while the convention was in session, urging the Federation to pass "a ringing resolution in support of votes for women."

It counted for nothing, of course, to the Suffrage Association that such action as it urged would be a betrayal of the interests of thousands of women's clubs affiliated with the Federation whose members are opposed to woman suffrage; and that one of the first consequences would have been the weakening of the Federation by the withdrawal of such clubs. What the Suffrage Association wanted was a declaration which it could use for campaign material. It wanted something which could afford a basis for the claim that the women's clubs throughout the country were in favor of woman suffrage, and it did not care about the cost.

But the Federation was not to be beguiled into such a policy. Mrs. Moore, the retiring President, held that woman suffrage was not germane to the work of the Federation, and that the endorsement of it would be a blow to the Federation. Mrs. Pennybacker, whom the convention elected President for the next term, declared that it would be unwise to make suffrage an issue. The Committee on Resolutions refused to report a suffrage resolution; and, when such a resolution was presented from the floor, the President, in spite of vehement suffrage protests, ruled it out of order. So the movement failed; and the General Federation was left free to continue its legitimate work, unhampered by any declaration upon a divisive and essentially political question.

CALIFORNIA WOMEN DID NOT WANT THE BALLOT

THE Bangor Commercial directs attention to the fact that, at the first opportunity which the women of California had to use their right to the ballot—at the Presidential primary in May—not more than 20 per cent. of those who were qualified to register and vote did so.

In Massachusetts, Connecticut, and other eastern states, when reference is made to the small number of women who exercise school suffrage, the suffragists always reply that it is not surprising that women do not vote in large numbers when only minor issues are involved. But, at the California Presidential primary, there was an exciting contest between the supporters of Taft, Roosevelt and La Follette, and it might well have been supposed that the women of the state would have been eager to exercise their new right.

If the adoption of the suffrage amendment in California could have been left to a referendum of the women of the state,—a proposition which the suffragists always oppose,—it never would have been adopted. It was through the mistaken chivalry of men that the amendment was incorporated in the constitution. Perhaps, if they had it to do over again, in view of the manifest indifference of women to the vote, they would reverse their action.

AS TO THAT "UPLIFT"

Apropos of the often-repeated claim that woman suffrage will bring about a great "uplift" in politics and government, it is instructive to note the views of a number of Colorado women as published in the Denver Republican. The women quoted are all enthusiastic suffragists and interested in the extension of the suffrage movement. But one of them, Mrs. D. Bryant Turner, speaks as follows upon this subject:

"As for the old question, 'Will women uplift and purify politics?' the answer to that is: 'Why should they be expected to?'

"The difficult 'uplifting' job in all things is one that men have usually been willing to hand over to their sisters; and, although it is very flattering, the fact is that women are no better than men along any lines."

In similar vein, Mrs. Horton Pope says:

"Whether women will purify politics, uplift man, or stand for a higher moral tone is entirely beside the question."

And Mrs. Frank Woodward says with equal candor:

One is so often asked if women have purified politics, as if the woman's movement was a reform movement. As I look at it, human nature is much the same whether in man or woman, and therefore perfection is quite impossible. Women do not want to reform the world, but merely to see that they receive their just rights."

These expressions from suffrage women in a suffrage state, printed in parallel columns with some of the extravagant claims which suffragists are in the habit of making regarding the civic improvement and moral uplift to be looked for as a result of women's votes, would make instructive reading.

NOT GOOD "SPORTS"

Mrs. Lucia Ames Mead, a life-long suffragist, has published in The Independent—a journal always friendly to suffrage—an article on "Violence and Votes" which strongly condemns the militant methods of the English suffragettes, and completely disposes of the historic parallels by the use of which it has been attempted to justify their conduct.

Mrs. Mead shows that, when the British Parliament, in 1832, 1867 and 1884, extended suffrage to men, it never did so because of intimidation.

There was some violence, generally from the lowest orders in society, but never any organized by reformers. There was some rioting in 1831, when Nottingham Castle was set on fire and a mob of drunken vagrants at Bristol burned some buildings; but these mobs were utterly rude and irresponsible; and Mrs. Mead very justly asks: "Is this hooliganism of hungry, drunken mobs eighty years ago a precedent for the deliberate, organized violence of women, in this age, who have ten times the political and industrial rights which those downtrodden, illiterate men had in those days?"

As to the throwing overboard of the tea in Boston harbor, which American defenders of the English militants are fond of citing as a precedent, Mrs. Mead shows that the act was not vandalism, and that mere destructiveness as intimidation was the last thing thought of. The tea was destroyed because it was impossible to return it to England or to leave it on shipboard, and to land it meant the defeat of the whole contention of the colonists. As to the defenders of the English militants, Mrs. Mead pertinently inquires:

"Do not the condoners of their vandalism show an astonishing incapacity to perceive relative values when they cry out that 'Parliament should remember that the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church?" Pray when have martyrs ever thrown stones at the men who sent them to the rack and the stake? Was it not their Christlike willingness to suffer without reprisal that placed the halo around their heads? The perverse ratiocination which creates euphemisms like the word 'protests' for throwing brick-bats, which conjures up visions of thumb-screws and Iron Virgins by the word 'torture' as applied to forcing nourishment upon would-be prisoners and would-be suicides, does not commend the militant sense of fairness to the public, which is inclined to ask, 'If they choose voluntarily to go to prison, why don't they act like good sports and not complain when they get what they want?"

"Faithful are the wounds of a friend." It is significant that this most effective exposure of militant fallacies and condemnation of militant methods should come from one whose personal loyalty to the suffrage cause cannot be questioned.

MISS ADDAMS AND POLITICS

The course which Miss Jane Addams took, in attending the national Progressive convention as a delegate, serving on the committee on resolutions, and seconding the nomination of Mr. Roosevelt, has created a sharp division of sentiment among suffragists.

The National American Woman Suffrage Association declares itself to be non-partisan. Miss Addams is First Vice-President of that Association. Her political activities at Chicago, and her subsequent appointment on the National Committee of the Progressive party derived their chief significance from the fact that she held that office.

The Woman's Journal of Aug. 17, admitting that there was "some confusion of thought" on the question, defended her course on the ground that the non-partisan obligations of the Association were binding only upon the society as a society and not upon individual members.

But Mrs. Ida Husted Harper uses very plain words in describing Miss Addams' conduct. In a letter in the New York Times of August 10, she said that Miss Addams and other Chicago suffragists "violated the unbroken tradition and unwritten law of the National Association since its founding in 1869, that its members must be absolutely non-partisan, that they must not endorse parties or candidates further than to express appreciation of favorable action toward woman suffrage." She added that Miss Addams "should first have resigned her national office" before taking the part which she did in the Progressive convention. Other leading suffragists have expressed similar views. Miss Caroline Lexow, executive of the Women's Political Union of New York, in an interview in the New York Sun of August 10, declared that Miss Addams had made a great mistake; and Miss Elinor Byrns, acting press representative of the national suffrage association, in an interview in the New York Tribune, August 10, suggested that "political women" were "doing rather a dangerous thing in working for party candidates."

Altogether, the suffragists seem likely to have rather a difficult time in persuading the public to make a distinction between what Miss Jane Addams did as an individual, and what she did as the next to the highest officer in the National Woman Suffrage Association.

A TRAGIC MISTAKE

(From the Chicago Record-Herald)

The husband of a New York suffragist was finally persuaded to march in the suffrage parade in that city. He demurred for a long time, but was at last won over. His wife beamed delight when she finally saw him started with the gorgeous galaxy, carrying bravely a banner. But untold was her discomfiture when she discovered late in the afternoon that he had accompanied the parade for only two blocks and then had beat an unmilitant retreat.

"John, why didn't you carry that banner this afternoon as I asked you to?" she queried distressedly.

"Did you read that banner you gave me?" he replied.

"No."

"If you had, you wouldn't have expected me to carry it. It said, 'A man can vote. Why can't I?'"

WOMEN IN PARLIAMENT

(To The Nineteenth Century for August, Mr. W. H. Mallock contributed a play called "Women in Parliament," purporting to be from the Greek of Aristophanes, and to have been acted at Athens, B. C. 393. Certain modern allusions throw doubt upon the antiquity of the play. Mrs. Pankagoras and other Athenian women under her leadership plan to array themselves in men's garb, take possession of the National Assembly, and rule Athens. The following extract is a part of the speech in which Mrs. Pankagoras unfolds her plan.)

Mrs. Pankagoras. Citizens,
You have heard what's just been said. There's no man living
I would suggest as ruler. Men have been tried,
And all found wanting. What I beg to move
Is that from this hour forth the reins of state
Be taken from men's hands, which scarce can hold them,
And placed in Woman's.

Several Women. Hear, hear, hear. Go on.

Mrs. Pankagoras. Does my proposal startle you? Consider.
What is this malady of which we die?
A constant love of change. If some sound course
Is settled on to-day, we fickle men
Are tired of it to-morrow—tired, and why?
Because it is not new enough; and we clamor
For something bad that's newer. Where's the State
Can thrive that's ruled like this? There's always more
In any State, as in your own live limbs,
To be conserved than changed. You break your leg:
Well, if you wish to mend it, true it is
You must change something: but the things you change
Are nought compared to those you keep from changing
If that same leg is ever to go again,
And carry you as of old. Wherefore, I say,
Since men have proved so vain and variable,
Seeking for changes where no change can be,
Let Woman take Man's place; because in her,
Steadfast and steady, wedded by experience
To the daily acts and facts that always must be,
Never, like men, hysterical, the Gods
Have given to Man the true Conservative—
Conservative of all that makes life possible,
And saves the world from chaos.

Several Women. Hear, hear, hear. Tell us some more about the true Conservative.

Mrs. Pankagoras. Still as of old to blow the fire she squats.
Still as of old she stands to stir the pots.
With the same dripping still she bastes her meats;
Still in her store-room sucks the self-same sweets,
Still with two hands she grasps the eternal broom,
And holds the handle whilst she sweeps the room.
Still if her little store be nearly spent,
She cooks still less, and teaches Man content.
If Man remonstrates, still she talks him down,
Or stops his talking with a single frown.
When frowns suffice not, still her lips can scold;
And still the husband trembles as of old.
Then, friends and countrymen, let him who can
Deny that Woman's born to govern Man.

Here I suppose that some one interrupts me, and I make answer thus:
What said that gentleman? Did I hear aright?
"Woman can't rule because she cannot fight?"
I'm glad that question's raised; for here's my answer.
Not fight? In the true sense I say she can, sir.
When to the field the mailèd warriors go,
With every sinew swollen to fell the foe,
You'll grant me this—each warrior must be fed
Often, and must be sometimes put to bed.
Well, then, who does this? Woman cooks his meats,
She pats his pillow smooth, she airs his sheets.
Those, those who tuck the warrior up at night,
And fry his food, are those that really fight.

Philena. My dear, you're quite magnificent.

Mrs. Pankagoras. Not I,
But Woman speaking through me. And now—now—
Struggle into those great big boots of yours,
Tie on your beards: pull well about your noses
Your husbands' collars. Grasp your walking-sticks,
And march. Time presses. If we are late, we are lost.

[*Exeunt* MRS. PANKAGORAS *and the women, singing.*

"PURELY PERSONAL"

The Cleveland *Plain Dealer* having advised Ohio voters to decide the woman suffrage question according to the preference of the women of their respective households, a suffragist reader made vehement protest and asked indignantly: "Why should the women of one household decide the question of another woman's voting any more than they should decide the manner of dressing her hair, or any other purely personal question?"

This view of the suffrage is not often so naively expressed, but it is widely held among suffragists. They look upon the ballot as a purely personal thing. If a thousand women want it, or a hundred, or one, it should be given without hesitation, even if ten thousand women or a hundred thousand women not only do not want it but regard it as a burden to themselves and a menace to society.

Obviously, a woman may dress her hair as she pleases, and no one except those immediately connected with her will be afflicted if she dresses it ill.

But a woman cannot be given the ballot without a change which involves putting the responsibilities of the ballot upon all women of voting age. It is as far as possible from being a "purely personal matter"; it is a matter of the gravest public concern, with momentous consequences. Women who think of the ballot so lightly and describe it so flippantly are not likely to use it wisely if it is given to them.

THE PROTECTION OF GIRLS

The postal authorities at Washington, becoming aware that the privileges of the general delivery mail window in the large cities were being abused, and that flighty and thoughtless young women were there receiving letters from men which they were not willing to have addressed to their homes, gave general instructions recently to city postmasters to take steps to prevent young women from obtaining their mail at the general delivery window. The postmasters are to inquire the addresses of young women who apply for their mail there, and are to ask also their reasons for not receiving their mail at their homes.

These orders are intended to conserve the public morals. The general delivery window was established as a convenience to the traveling public, not for the promotion of flirtations. It is right that it should be kept for its original purpose.

Every one who knows anything about modern city life knows the sort of perils which beset young girls. Designing men seek every possible way to beguile and entrap them. The general delivery window often becomes one of the outposts of the white slave traffic.

It might be supposed that every sane and intelligent person would approve the efforts of the postal authorities to check this evil. But, no; The Woman's Journal is highly indignant that girls and young women should be subject to such a discrimination. It insists that there is no good reason for making a distinction of sex. "If it is thought fit," The Woman's Journal says, "to require all minors to have their mail delivered at their homes, well and good; but young men are quite as likely as young women to use the general delivery for objectionable purposes. Why should they be given a free hand?"

Apparently The Journal means that young women ought to be allowed to go to the bad, if young men are; and that an attempt to prevent it is a "sex discrimination." But right-thinking people, who are not obsessed by suffragist prejudices, must realize that it is not boys and young men but girls and young women who are in peril at the general delivery window, and must approve accordingly the postal regulation.

(*From the Milwaukee Free Press—By Permission.*)

THE LOUISIANA PROPOSAL

The proposed amendment to Article 210 of the constitution of the state of Louisiana, which is to be submitted to the voters at the November election, has been generally described as a "school suffrage" amendment.

As a matter of fact, it says nothing about school suffrage. It provides merely "that resident women over the age of twenty-five years shall be eligible to hold any office connected with the public educational system of the state, or of any ward, parish or municipality in the state, and to hold any office in the state connected with institutions of charity or correction."

And it is this modest proposition which is described by The Woman's Journal as "the greatest victory of womanhood in Louisiana."

"MUCH CRY, LITTLE WOOL"

Under the above heading Miss Blackwell, in The Woman's Journal for July 27, tried to minimize the recent outbreaks of English suffragettes. She advised "a healthy skepticism" toward the press reports of the doings of the militant suffragists; charged that the transatlantic cablegrams on this subject "are almost invariably colored and twisted"; and affirmed that " the militant women have thus far been careful to avoid doing serious physical injury to any one," although "Their zeal and resourcefulness are so great that, if they really meant to kill Mr. Asquith, his life would not be worth twenty-four hours' purchase."

As to the particular disturbances about which Miss Blackwell wrote, THE REMONSTRANCE takes the following summary of them, not from any hostile source, but from the New York Independent, a journal long friendly to woman suffrage:

"The visit of Premier Asquith to Ireland was made the occasion of unprecedented attacks, from which the large force of police and detectives could not protect him. While he was being driven through the streets of Dublin with Mrs. Asquith, John Redmond and the Lord Mayor, a hatchet was thrown at him, but hit Mr. Redmond instead, inflicting a wound on the temple. The missile was thrown by Mrs. Mary Leigh, who has been imprisoned eight times for suffragette disturbances. An attempt was made to burn down the Theater Royal, in which the Premier was to speak, by a woman occupying a box, who threw into the orchestra a chair soaked in oil and set on fire. The fire was extinguished, but the curtains were burnt and a panic narrowly averted."

These are some of the manifestations of which Miss Blackwell, the responsible editor of The Woman's Journal, speaks so lightly. These women in Dublin threw a hatchet at the Prime Minister, regardless of whom they might kill, and they tried to burn the theater in which he was to speak, regardless of the frightful loss of life which might follow a panic, yet Miss Blackwell gravely assures her readers that "the militant women have thus far been careful to avoid doing serious physical injury to any one."

The Woman's Journal never has published a word of editorial condemnation of even the wildest and most violent demonstrations of the English suffragettes. And it is altogether probable that if they were to employ their "zeal and resourcefulness" in the manner hinted at, we should find The Woman's Journal defending or apologizing for them.

WOMEN AS NONPARTISANS

Mrs. Ida Husted Harper, in her letter regarding Miss Addams, to which reference is made elsewhere, made two suggestions which deserve further attention. She said that, by reason of Miss Addams' course at the Progressive convention at Chicago, "her influence when appearing before bodies of men especially will not be so strong as heretofore;" and she asked, "What did Miss Addams secure from the Progressive convention that it would not have given if she had maintained a non-partisan attitude?"

Can it have occurred to Mrs. Harper that she was applying to this particular incident the broad general principle on which women who oppose suffrage base their case? If Miss Addams lost influence by identifying herself with a political party, is it not true that women in general would lose influence by joining in the contests of politics? And if Miss Addams could have secured what she sought while maintaining a non-partisan attitude, is not the same thing true of women in general?

Called upon to choose between the doubtful advantages of partisanship and political activity on the one hand, and the privileges which they now enjoy, the influence they now exert, and the opportunities for usefulness which are now theirs, on the other hand, the great majority of American women choose the latter.

"LIVING THEIR OWN LIVES"

(Harold Owen in the London Daily Chronicle)

Feminism teaches women to live their own lives; to abjure duty to any but themselves; to make no sacrifice to any racial idea or purpose. Feminism is all for the individual and not at all for the race. The whole point of view of feminism is concerned with the woman—not with the adult male or the human child. Whether wages for wives are asked, whether maintained wifehood is regarded as parasitism or serfhood, whether woman should be economically independent on the one hand or insist on more liberal maintenance and fresh privileges on the other hand, or whether a woman shall refuse to complicate her existence at all by any relations with the male, the whole burden and song of feminism is the individual self.

Well, with any reprobation or examination of those ethics I am not now concerned; I am merely trying to be a temperamental neuter stating facts. But if there are any people whom these ethics outrage (as I conceive to be possible) let me merely give them this consolation. Nature herself has provided a remedy for that extreme individualism which does not fulfil race functions, but insists on its own individual well-being (as it conceives it) and "lives its own life." And the remedy provided by Nature is that it takes such individuals at their own word. They do live their own lives—and then die out.

GIRDLING THE TREE

(Everett P. Wheeler in The New York Times)

The women of Colorado and other western states were brought up in homes untainted by the female politician. They still show the results of early training and the instincts of nature are strong. It is like a man who begins to girdle a tree. He can point to the leaves and declare that they are still green. Afterward when his girdling is done, the leaves fall and the tree slowly dies.

IN OHIO, as elsewhere in states which have given woman the school ballot, comparatively few women have used it. A writer in the Columbus Dispatch states that not more than 3 per cent of the women entitled to vote have ever voted at school elections in that state.

NOT WOMAN'S WORK

The woman suffragists are making progress—in a certain direction.

They used to deny rather strenuously that there was anything in their movements which could disturb the normal life of woman. They insisted that there was nothing incompatible between political activities and women's life in the home. Voting, they said, was a small matter. A woman may vote on her way to market. There is nothing interrupting or disturbing about that. They even advertised, through the management of The Woman's Journal, for the names of suffragists who had families. All this to show that no menace to the normal woman's life is involved either in the agitation for the ballot, or the use of it.

But their tone is changing. Mrs. O. H. P. Belmont, in a statement published by the Chicago Examiner of July 29th, says plainly:

"The highest sphere for woman is not the home, but independence. The girl who is earning a good salary is unwise and a coward if she gives up her position to marry any man."

And Mrs. Helen Ware Dennett, secretary of the National Woman Suffrage Association, in a statement published in the New York Sun, resents the idea that domestic labor is a women's problem. She says:

"It isn't their problem any more than it is the men's. Keeping the house and rearing the children is, or at least ought to be, not sex work, but human work. And until it is so regarded the domestic labor problem will remain unsolved. Just because a human being happens to be a woman it does not follow that housekeeping is her vocation any more than it follows that because a woman happens to bear a child she is fitted to rear it. There are hundreds of thousands of mothers who are not fitted to rear their children. No one can deny that. And there are legions of woman housekeepers who are not fitted to keep house and never could be. At least they could more naturally and successfully be something else. On the other hand, there are plenty of men who would and do make good cooks and waiters and managers of households, large and small. The only solution is to give woman absolute economic independence and to make housekeeping human work, not merely woman's work."

A RASH ASSERTION

Speaking at Chautauqua July 10th, Mrs. Ida Husted Harper said: "Foremost among the opponents of woman suffrage are found all who are in any way connected with the liquor business. They have for many years formed the strongest influence in American politics, and are the implacable, relentless, everlasting foe of woman suffrage."

This sounds impressive, but is it true? Is it not a well-known fact that, in the present campaign in Wisconsin the suffragists have crowded the Woman's Christian Temperance Union one side, and have coquetted with the great brewing interests?

NOTES ON SUFFRAGE AND ANTI-SUFFRAGE

CONGRATULATIONS are due to the Ohio Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, to Mrs. Hermon M. Hubbard, its energetic and self-sacrificing President, to its other officers, and to Miss Minnie Bronson and the other anti-suffrage speakers, for the splendid victory of September 3.

IT has been freely asserted, and is probably very widely believed, that whatever may be said against the militant tactics of the English suffragettes, these violent demonstrations have really advanced the cause of suffrage. But Miss A. Royden, of the Executive Committee of the National Union of Suffrage Societies in England, declares that this is not true. She writes that "militancy in the women's suffrage movement has done terrible harm, and is responsible for our first defeat in the House of Commons for very many years." This is in accord with the view of most unprejudiced observers. It is interesting to have it confirmed from so authoritative a source.

THE Canadian Premier, Mr. Borden, on his visit to London late in August, was waited upon by a delegation from the Women's Social and Political Union, who threatened that, if he did not introduce a suffrage measure into the Dominion Parliament they would take measures to divert emigration to Australia and New Zealand which might otherwise go to Canada; and would also introduce militant tactics into Canada. But Mr. Borden was not daunted by either threat. He told his visitors that the Dominion Parliament has nothing to do with the franchise, which rests with the provincial legislatures; and he added that no suggestion of the employment of methods of any kind would have the slightest influence.

"THE WOMAN'S JOURNAL" professes to believe that the Portsmouth brewery was "one of the main forces" which defeated the suffrage amendment in the New Hampshire Constitutional Convention. This has a familiar sound. The Journal has regularly attributed the repeated defeats of suffrage amendments in Oregon to the liquor interests. But this explanation looks queer when placed beside the facts. In 1906, the Oregon voters had before them a liquor-dealers' measure and a suffrage amendment. They defeated the amendment, and, if the Journal's theory were correct, they should have adopted the liquor measure. But they didn't. They defeated it by almost exactly the same majority by which they defeated the amendment. Again, in 1908, there were submitted, among other questions, the Reddy bill, a pro-liquor measure, and the suffrage amendment. The same thing happened. The voters defeated suffrage, but they also defeated the liquor measure. How could this have happened if the liquor vote was an anti-suffrage vote?

AT THE CONVENTIONS

The suffragists were disappointed in their efforts to induce one or both of the leading political parties to pronounce in favor of woman suffrage.

At Chicago, Miss Jane Addams and Dr. Sophonisba Breckinridge urged the Republican Committee on Resolutions to incorporate a suffrage plank in the platform; and at Baltimore Rev. Anna H. Shaw, the president of the National Woman Suffrage Association, presented a similar plea; but neither committee yielded to the demand.

This was wise conservatism; for, aside from the general merits of the question, the subject upon which these national conventions were asked to declare themselves is not a matter of national but of state concern. The constitution of the United States wisely leaves the determination of the qualifications of voters to the several states, subject only to the provisions of the Fifteenth Amendment; and a national convention which declares a policy upon this question exceeds its proper functions.

RIGHTEOUS SENTENCES

On the 7th of August, at Dublin, Mrs. Mary Leigh and Miss Gladys Evans, English suffragists, who were convicted of setting fire to the Theater Royal on July 18, placing in the theater a quantity of gunpowder and causing an explosion likely to cause serious injury to property and to endanger life, were sentenced to five years' penal servitude; and Mrs. Lizzie Baker, who had pleaded guilty to a charge of causing malicious injury to the theater, was sentenced to seven months' imprisonment with hard labor.

The attempt to burn the theater was made just as the audience was leaving. Mr. Asquith was to speak in the theater on the 19th.

Mrs. Leigh was further charged with throwing a hatchet at a carriage in which Mr. and Mrs. Asquith, the Lord Mayor and Mr. John Redmond were riding,—the hatchet inflicting a slight wound upon Mr. Redmond; but her trial upon that charge was put over till October.

The sentences imposed by the court are righteous sentences; and there should be no waste of sympathy upon the women upon whom they were imposed. The attempt to burn the theater was incendiarism, and that of a sort which might have resulted in a disastrous panic. The throwing of the hatchet was an assault with a murderous weapon; and the woman who threw it was apparently indifferent whether the weapon hit Mr. Asquith or Mrs. Asquith or either of the other occupants of the carriage.

These are not political offences, but attacks upon the social order and upon human life. If society has not the right to protect itself against such outbreaks of wanton violence, law and government might as well be abolished.

"AN APPLE OF DISCORD"

(From a Paper by Justice William H. Timlin of the Wisconsin Supreme Court)

To confer the suffrage upon women is to throw an apple of discord between husband and wife. If the wife always agrees with and votes with her husband, the effect of the law is merely to give him two votes; if the husband always agrees with and votes with her, the effect is to give her two votes; in such cases the law is useless. If she is expected to exercise independent political judgment, this will promote domestic discord and weaken family ties by the mere fact of disagreement and discussion. It would be bad if it stopped here; but in order to make her vote effective, she must act with some organization, frequently supporting some other man against her husband. She must meet, confer, canvass, consult and also learn the low practices and little dirty deceits of politics or submit to be overreached by those who practice such. What of the children who are growing up while father is working, caucusing or making speeches for Smith on the democratic ticket, while mother is out until midnight with other associates whooping it up for Jones on the republican ticket? If you are inclined to think this picture overdrawn, just recall your own experience of the fate of those who attempted to carry on a dignified political campaign.

WHAT THE SUFFRAGISTS PROMISE

(Dr. William Hirsch in The New York Times)

How little the female agitators know about the real significance of voting, and how insincere they are in their agitation, is shown by the very reasons they give in favor of their "cause." So, for instance, they blame the "voting of men" for all political and social difficulties and evils, and "promise," with absolute certainty relief from all those evils and a general political reformation by their votes. Such talk is almost too childish to be discussed seriously. If you let women vote, you will get, according to the suffragettes' promise, "an incorruptible government, sanitary conditions, pure food, pure water, prevention from infectious diseases, healthy cities, clean streets, better schools, better morals, better regulation of labor and taxation, better laws." This and a good deal more it is that the suffrage leaders promise from women's vote. These are the principal "arguments" for woman suffrage.

But now, let us ask, has any woman ever told you how all these wonders will be accomplished? Has any woman ever told you how she expects that her vote will bring this change about? Has any woman given this question any thought at all?

"ANTI-SUFFRAGE: Ten Good Reasons" (Duffield & Co. 50 cents net), the concise, up-to-date and serviceable volume by Mrs. Grace Duffield Goodwin, President of the District Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, Washington, D. C., continues to win appreciative comment. The Chicago Tribune says of it:

The little book is of special value in that it contains no violent denunciations of any cause or prophet. Its whole tone is restrained and wholesome; and it sounds a note of warning against ungoverned actions and hysterical outbursts and the methods of warfare which are "childishly lawless where militant, ignorant or cruel where pacific."